Underlying vision for the Eleventh Five Year Plan as highlighted in the Approach Paper is inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities. A provision of Rs. 1396 crore has been made for persons with disabilities during Eleventh Five Plan, disability concerns are dealt with by a number of Ministries. However, under the budget head of Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, specific allocations are made for the persons with disabilities.

Setting up of sovereign wealth fund

2734. SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Planning Commission had recommended Government to set up a sovereign wealth fund to make use of the swelling foreign exchange reserves;

(b) if so, whether Government has accepted the recommendation;

(c) if so, by when the same would come into operation and explain the salient features of the proposed fund;

(d) whether the proceeds deposited in the fund would be reinvested in various sectors of the economy; and

(e) if so, the sector which are expected to be benefited?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (e) Do not arise.

Mid-term review of Tenth Plan

2735. SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that according to the mid-term review of the Tenth Five Year Plan 2002-07 only 14 out of 37 Central Government Ministries were allocating funds under the Special Component Plan in proportion to the Scheduled Castes Population;

(b) if so, whether it did not come to the notice of the co-ordination Wing of the Cabinet Secretariat which is functioning specifically to ensure that Government orders and instructions are followed by all the Ministries in letter and spirit; and

(c) the position at the completion of the Tenth Plan?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) and (c) As per the Mid-Term Appraised of Tenth Five Year Plan published in June, 2005 there were 14 Central Ministries/Departments have been earmarking funds under SCP. However, as on 31 March, 2008, 20 Central Ministries/Departments have allocated funds under the Special Component Plan.

Recommendation of National Knowledge Commission

2736. SHRI TARIQ ANWAR: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that National Knowledge Commission has recommended for closing of All India Council for Technical Education;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons for this recommendation; and

(c) the reaction of Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) The relevant extract from the recommendations of the National knowledge Commission is annexed as Statement which gives reasons therefor. (*See* below)

(c) A UGC/AICTE Review Committee has been constituted by Ministry of Human Resource Development on 28th February, 2008 to review the role of statutory bodies like the University Grants Commission and the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) in the context of changes in higher, professional and technical education in the country and demands of a new knowledge economy.

Extracts from the recommendations of National Knowledge Commission on Education-Compilation of Recommendations on Education

Section 4. REGULATION

There is a clear need to establish an Independent Regulatory Authority for Higher Education (IRAHE). Such a regulatory authority is both necessary and desirable.

It is necessary for two important reasons. First, in India, it requires and Act of Legislature of Parliament to set up a university. The deemed university route is much too difficult for new institutions. Entery through legislation alone, as at present, is a formidable barrier. The consequence is a steady increase in the average size of existing universities with a steady deterioration in their quality. The absence of competition only compounds problems. Second, as we seek to expand the higher education system, entry norms will be needed for private institutions and public-private partnerships. The institutional framework for this purpose must be put in place here and now.

It is desirable for four important reasons. First, it would minimise conflicts of interest as it would create an arm's-length distance from stakeholders. Second, it would replace the present system which is over-regulated but under-governed, through more appropriate forms of intervention. Third, it would rationalize the existing system where mandates are both confusing and overlapping. Fourth, it would dispense with the multiplicity of regulatory agencies to provide a single-window clearance.

The present regulatory system in higher education is flawed in many respects. The barriers to entry are too high. The system of authorizing entry is cumbersome. And there are extensive rules after entry, as the UGC seeks to regulate almost every aspect of an institution from fees to curriculum. The system is also based on aptently irrational principles. The UGC Act section 3.1.2(a) suggests that permission for receiving grants will be accorded only if the Commission is satisfied that the existing institutions in the state are not adequate to serve the needs of the state. The other regulators, say in the sphere of professional education, are often inconsistent in their adherence to principles. There are several instances where an engineering college or a business school is approved, promptly, in a small house of a metropolitan suburb without the requisite teachers, infrastructure or facilities, but established universities experience difficulties in obtaining similar approvals. Such examples can be multiplied. These would only confirm that the complexity, the multiplicity and the rigidity of the existing regulatory structure is not conductive to the expansion of higher education opportunities in India.

In sum, the existing regulatory framework constrains the supply of good institutions, excessively regulates existing institutions in the wrong places, and is not conuctive to innovation or creativity in higher education. The challenge is therefore to design a regulatory system that increase the supply of good institutions and fosters accountability in those institutions. An independent regulator has to be the cornerstone of such a system.

The proposed IRAHE will rationalize the principles on which entry is regulated. There are two aspects to this rationalization: what is to be regulated and what are the principles used for regulation.

In higher education, regulators perform five functions: (1) Entry: licence to grant degrees. (2) Accreditation: quality benchmarking. (3) Disbursement of public funds. (4) Access: fees or affirmative action (5) Licence: to practice profession.

India is perhaps the only country in the world where regulation in 4 of the 5 functions is carried out by one entity, that is, the UGC. The purpose of creating an IRAHE is to separate these functions. The proposed IRAHE shall be responsible for setting the criteria and deciding on entry. It would, in addition, license agencies to take care of accrediation. The role of the UGC will be limited to disbursing public funds. Issues of access will be governed by state legislation on reservations and other forms of affirmative action. And, professional associations may, in some institutions, set requirements to determine eligibility for conducting a profession.All other regulatory agencies such as the AICTE will need to be abolished while the MCI and the BCI will be limited to their role as professional associations. These professional associations could conduct nationwide examinations to provide licences for those wishing to enter the profession.

The second aspect of regulation is the principle used to regulate. The IRAHE will determine eligibility for setting up a new institution based on transparent criteria rather than discretionary controles. Its main role would be to exercise due diligence at the point it approves a licence to grant degrees. In doing so, it would assess the academic credibility and the financial viability of the proposed institution on the basis of information submitted in accordance with the stipulated criteria. It will apply exactly the same norms to public and private institutions, just as it will apply the same norms to domestic and international institutions.

The IRAHE would be constituted as follows. It would have a Chairperson and six Members, The tenure of the Chairpersons would be six years. The tenure of the Members would also be six years. One-third of the Members of the Authority will retire every two years. The Chairperson would be a distinguished academic from any discipline with experience of governance in higher education. The Members would be distinguished academics drawn from the following sets of disciplines: physical sciences, life sciences, social sciences, humanities and professional subjects such as engineering, medicine, law or management. The IRAHE could have some part-time members or standing Committees drawn from academia to advise the Authority in each of the aforesaid sets of disciplines. The Chairperson and the Members of the IRAHE would be appointed by the Prime Minister based on the recommendations of a Search Committee.

The IRAHE would have to be established by an Act of Parliament. It would be the only agency that would be authorized to accord degree granting power to higher education institutions. It would also be responsible for monitoring standards and settling disputes. It should also be thought of as the authority for licensing accreditation agencies. The IRAHE must be at an arm's-length from the Government and independent of all stakeholders including the concerned Ministries of the Government. The Acts of the UGC, AICTE, MCI and BCI

would have to be amended. The role of the UGC would be re-defined to focus on the disbursement of grants to, and maintenance of, public institutions in higher education. The entry regulatory functions of the AICTE, the MCI and the BCI would be performed by the IRAHE, so that their role would be limited to that of professional associations. These professional associations could conduct nationwide examinations to provide licenses for those wishing to enter the profession.

Eleventh Five-Year Plan

†2737. SHRI LALIT KISHORE CHATURVEDI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Eleventh Five-Year Plan has been finalized;

(b) if so, main features of the above plan;

(c) the details of targets set and expenditure incurred on main infrastructure development activities; and

(d) the comparative difference between tenth and Eleventh Five-Year Plan?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) and (b) The National Development Council met on 19th December, 2007 and approved the draft Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-12). The broad vision of the Eleventh Plan includes several inter related components: rapid growth that reduces poverty and creates employment opportunities, increases access to essential services in health and education especially for the poor and disadvantaged, enhances equality of opportunity, empowers through education and skill development and promotes environmental sustainability.

(c) and (d) The Eleventh Plan has set monitorable targets, *inter alia*, for education, health and infrastructure sectors. The detailed sectoral allocation in Tenth and Eleventh Plan are as under:

Sectoral allocation : Tenth Plan and Eleventh Plan

(Rs. Crore at 2006-07 prices)

		Tenth Plan		Eleventh Plan	
Sl. No.	Sectors	BE#	%to Total	Projected Allocation	% to Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Education	62,461	7.68	2,74,228	19.29
2	Rural Development, Land resources and Panchayati Raj	87,041	10.70	1,90,330	13.39
3	Health FW and Ayush	45,771	5.62	1,23,900	8.71
4	Agriculture and irrigation	50,639	6.22	1,21,556	8.55
5	Social Justice	36,381	4.47	90,273	6.35
6	Physical Infrastructure	89,021	10.94	1,28,160	9.01
7	Scientific Departments	29,823	3.66	66,580	4.68
8	Energy	47,266*	5.81	57,409	4.04

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.